



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

QUARTERLY JOURNAL  
OF THE  
STATISTICAL SOCIETY.

---

MARCH, 1857.

---

*On the Existing Connection between American Slavery and the British Cotton Manufacture.* By J. T. DANSON, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

[Read before the British Association at Cheltenham, August, 1856.]

THE following statement has been drawn up with the purpose of displaying, as clearly as may be, the actual relation, at the present moment, of the slave system of the United States to the cotton manufactures of the United Kingdom. It has no political object, other than that of averting such misconception as often leads to mistaken action; and that in a matter in which to act with perfect discretion may possibly not, when the time for action comes, be found extremely easy; but in which any serious error on our part would probably be visited, in the natural course of things, with very heavy and widely-felt penalties. It is based entirely upon public documents, and other well-known authorities. It is not intended to support, or to oppose, either slavery in general, or any particular form of it. Its sole purpose is, to show how far we, as a nation, are implicated in the pending dispute. And this will be done simply by bringing together, under one view, facts already well established, placing them together in logical sequence, and stating the conclusions to which, being so placed, they have conducted myself.

---

After mature consideration, I deduce from the materials now before me, and which I am about to lay before you, the conclusions:—

I. That, in the present state of the commercial relations of the two countries, the cotton-planters of the United States are interested, to the extent of about two-thirds of their exportable produce, in the maintenance of the cotton manufacture of the United Kingdom—and,

II. That, reciprocally, the cotton-manufacturers of the United Kingdom, and, through them, the entire population of the kingdom, are interested, to the extent of four-fifths of the raw material of that manufacture, in the existing arrangements for maintaining the cotton culture of the United States.

---

These conclusions I base on the following propositions:—

1. That cotton must be grown, almost entirely, out of Europe, and manufactured chiefly in Europe; and, in Europe, chiefly in Great Britain.

2. That cotton has hitherto been grown, and, *as far as yet appears*, must continue to be grown, chiefly by slave-labour.

3. That, for the last fifty years, Great Britain, seeking her supply of cotton all over the earth, with a preference, during the greater part of that period, for the produce of free labour, has yet received, during the whole of that period, and continues to receive, all the cotton she imports of the better qualities, and by far the greater part of all she imports, in bulk as well as in value, from countries in which it is grown by slave-labour.

4. That cotton is grown in the United States exclusively by slave-labour.

5. That two-thirds, at least, of the slave population of the United States are employed in raising cotton for exportation.

6. That of the cotton thus raised for exportation, about two-thirds in quantity, and more than two-thirds in value, is raised expressly for the British market, and is regularly imported into, and manufactured in, the United Kingdom; and

7. That of the entire quantity of cotton imported into, and manufactured in, the United Kingdom, nearly four-fifths in quantity, and more than four-fifths in value, is, on an average of years, obtained from the United States.

It would have been more agreeable to me, and, also, no doubt, to those who may read this communication, to dispense with the formality with which I have stated these propositions; but no grace of composition, were I successful in attempting it, would here compensate for want of fulness or of accuracy.

I proceed now to state the evidence on which these several propositions are founded.

---

#### FIRST PROPOSITION.

##### *Cotton—the Localities of its Growth and Manufacture.*

The cotton plant appears to be indigenous between the tropics, wherever certain needful conditions of soil and climate are found. It flourishes best near the sea coast; and the best qualities can only be produced there. It cannot be grown to any extent within the limits of Europe.

Napoleon I. tried, in 1807, to grow it in France, but did not succeed. It has been grown in the south of Spain, and is grown in Italy; but in quantities too small to be appreciable in commerce.\*

The raw material then must, for commercial purposes, be produced out of Europe.

But it, cannot, with one exception, (to be referred to presently,) be manufactured, to meet the present demand, out of Europe; for nowhere else are to be found the requisite appliances of capital and skilled labour.

In short, nowhere on earth does there co-exist, nor can we, under anything like existing circumstances, expect that there will co-exist,

---

\* To some of those who may refer to our Trade Accounts on this point it may be necessary to observe that the port of shipment does not always indicate the locality of production. Cotton is sometimes landed where it will be re-shipped; and then the chances are that it will be sent to the greatest market for cotton—Great Britain.

on or near the same spot, the means of both raising the raw material and converting it into manufactured goods.

The extent of the consumption of cotton goods in the world is, therefore, the measure of a commerce between Europe and other parts of the world, which must, with all its needful antecedents and consequences, be maintained so long as that consumption shall go on.

Now for the exception. It is formed by the existence of cotton factories in some of the states of the American union. Nearly all these factories are in the states north of Virginia, and east of Ohio. More than one-third in value of the goods produced are produced in Massachusetts alone; and the greater part of the rest in Rhode Island, New York, and Pennsylvania. They evidently derive no appreciable advantage from slave-labour. Nor have they much advantage in the proximity of the raw material. The distance from Charleston, the nearest of the great cotton ports, to Boston, by sea, cannot be taken at less than 1,200 miles. The price of labour (wages) and the price of capital (interest) are both higher in these states than in Great Britain. Hence it is apparent why these factories cannot compete with those of Britain, except in the supply of some coarse fabrics for American use—fabrics in which the freight of the raw material, as an element of cost, is at a maximum.

The following figures show the extent to which, notwithstanding these domestic manufactures, the people of the United States consume the cotton manufactures of Europe; and the very small extent to which, notwithstanding their commercial intercourse with every part of the world, they can dispose of their own cotton goods in foreign markets:—

The average annual value of the cotton manufactures *imported into* the United States in the four years 1848-49-50-51 was 19,964,702 dollars, or 3,992,940*l.* sterling.

The average annual value of the cotton manufactures *exported from* the United States in the same four years, was 5,656,740 dollars, or 1,131,348*l.* sterling.

I might have quoted the corresponding figures for later years; but the result would not have been materially different. And I prefer taking the figures from documents of a public character, bearing the highest degree of authenticity, and which have already had wide circulation. I derive those given above from the Revenue Tables published by the Board of Trade, Supplement to Part XVIII, pages 908 to 920.

The *imports*, it should be observed, were made in the face of heavy duties, intended to “protect” the native manufactures.

Whence we may infer that, practically speaking, the raw material must be raised out of Europe, and manufactured in Europe.

It remains to indicate the particular localities apparently most favourable to each process.

As to the *raw material*. Touching the capability, now or at any past time, of any given locality to supply cotton, I assume that we can have no fitter test than the extent to which that locality does supply, or has supplied it. Resources merely capable of development are not here in question. It is the past, and the present, not the

future—the actual, not the possible—with which we have here to deal.

Further, as the present statement has no direct reference to the sources of supply to which other manufacturing countries may have had access, but only to those to which we ourselves have had access, we may safely simplify the application of the test by applying it from the records of our own trade. Nor, as we have, ever since the manufacture assumed any importance in Europe, not only been the largest consumers of the raw material, but also the richest, the most active, and the most enterprising explorers of the districts in which, alone, it could be found, is it probable that thus to narrow the ground of investigation will, to any material extent, affect the result. The supply, if any such exist, not open to us, is not likely to have yielded much to anybody.

In 1787 there were imported into Great Britain 22,600,000 lbs. of cotton, obtained from the following sources:—

	lbs.
British West Indies.....	6,600,000
French and Spanish Colonies.....	6,000,000
Dutch Colonies .....	1,700,000
Portuguese Colonies .....	2,500,000
East India (procured from Ostend) ....	100,000
Smyrna or Turkey .....	5,700,000

None from the United States.

In the three years 1824-5-6 we imported an annual average of 189,739,000 lbs.; and this quantity was obtained from the following sources, the imports of the three years being reduced to a similar average for each country:—

	lbs.		lbs.
United States of America	121,318,000	Turkey and Egypt.....	12,229,000
Brazil .....	22,600,000	West Indies .....	6,408,000
East Indies .....	17,184,000	All other countries .....	10,000,000

It should be observed that the imports from Turkey and Egypt, during these three years, sustained a great but temporary increase.

In the three years 1853-4-5 the total quantity imported reached an average of 891,452,000 lbs., obtained from the following sources:—

	lbs.		lbs.
United States .....	687,410,000	East Indies .....	148,954,000
Brazil .....	22,824,000	West Indies .....	409,000
Mediterranean .....	28,253,000	Other countries .....	3,602,000

Thus, in 1787, we received no part of our annual supply from the United States. In 1824-5-6 we received thence *sixty-four* per cent. of all we imported; and in 1853-4-5 this proportion had risen to *seventy-seven* per cent. Whence it may be fairly inferred that the United States possess advantages, in the culture and exportation of this article, which place them, in this respect, far a-head of all their competitors.

As to the *manufacture*. It has long been, and still is, a prime object with each of the commercial nations of Europe to supply itself from the raw material with this description of clothing. But the facilities they possess for doing this are by no means equal. Not one of them (excepting ourselves) can do it with any degree of complete-

ness; and some of them cannot do it at all, except by prohibiting the importation of foreign (chiefly British) cotton goods, or levying upon them heavy duties, to countervail the disadvantages under which the home manufacture is carried on. In these countries, however, in deference to a false theory of commerce, dear home-produce is yet very generally preferred to cheap foreign.

The only country in Europe which can, in any sense, be said to compete with our own in the supply of the extra-European demand for cotton goods, is France. And when the character, extent, and direction of this branch of the export trade of France is described, it will be seen that our most formidable rival is not one to be dreaded, though she undoubtedly offers us something to learn.

The year 1853 was a favourable one for the French trade. The French official accounts for that year are before me. They show that the quantity of raw cotton imported and retained for home consumption was 75,091,000 kilogrammes, or about 165,000,000 lbs., valued at 125,000,000 francs. The average quantity imported in the five years 1848-52 had been about 132 millions of lbs. There was also cotton yarn imported for French consumption, in 1853, to the value of 1,400,000 francs, which was not far from double the quantity imported on an average of the five years 1848-52. Here, however, we observe a rate of progression, in the importation of the raw material, scarcely greater than might be safely referred to the increasing wants of the home consumers; while the increasing importation of yarn seems to indicate a failure of competitive power in the first process of the manufacture. Nor does an examination of the export trade lead to a different conclusion.

In 1853 the cotton manufactures, of French production, exported from France were valued at 71,900,000 francs (2,876,000*l.*) This showed a slight, but only a slight increase, as compared with the average of 1848-52. The cotton yarn exported was valued at 866,000 francs (34,640*l.*)

---

But before these figures are passed, as marking the extent of the French export trade, there are, in strictness, one or two allowances to be made. The raw cotton was burdened with an import duty, and a bounty was allowed on the exportation of the manufactured goods. The precise effect of the apparent counterpoise can only be estimated somewhat vaguely.

The French tariff, in 1853, imposed five different rates of duty on raw cotton imported in French vessels, according to where it came from; and three other rates of duty, similarly distinguished, on cotton imported in foreign vessels. The duty most extensively operative—that on American cotton entering in French bottoms—was 20 francs per 100 kilogrammes, or about 1*s.* per 220 lbs. And, as the whole quantity imported (75,091,000 kilogrammes) yielded to the revenue 16,276,000 francs, giving an average of 22 francs or 23 francs per 100 kilogrammes, it is probable that by far the greater part of what was imported actually paid this rate of duty.

The bounty on exportation was 25 francs per 100 kilogrammes of manufactures or yarn. It was allowed, in 1853, on 7,117,864 kilogrammes of manufactures, and on 198,604 kilogrammes of yarn.

This, with a moderate allowance for waste of the raw material, though called a bounty (*prime*) could, in effect, have been little, if at all, more than a drawback of the import duty.

It would seem, then, that the French exports, in this kind, are not more than a tenth part in value of our own.

And now, where were they sent, and why? The largest customer for these French manufactures (taking two parts in seven of the whole value,) was Algeria. But Algerian consumption may be deemed, practically, French consumption. The two customers next on the list, when arranged in order of magnitude, were the United States and the United Kingdom. These took, between them, two other seventh parts of the whole. And the goods sold in the English and American markets are well known to owe their peculiar value rather to the designer and the dyer, than to the spinner and weaver. Their consumption does not admit of any very rapid or wide increase. French taste and French chemistry have deservedly won for French textile fabrics, wherever they are applicable, a superiority as well known as it is incontestible. But this has little effect in determining the locality of the cotton manufacture as a whole.

With a few trifling exceptions, of which cotton lace, imported from Belgium, is the only one worthy of notice, no foreign cotton manufactures were, in 1853, admitted to French consumption.

Whence the inference—not without consequence—that of all the nations of Europe our own is, apart from all artificial restrictions, the best fitted for so carrying on the manufacture of cotton as to supply the world-wide use it has now attained; and that the freer the trade, the more sure it is to fall into our hands; and the better, the cheaper, and the more abundant will be the supply to all.

#### THE SECOND PROPOSITION.

*That cotton has hitherto been grown, and, as far as yet appears, must continue to be grown, chiefly by slave-labour.*

The culture of cotton is, as has been stated, subject to certain natural conditions; and compliance with these, wherever such compliance is tolerably perfect, seems to exclude the employment of white labourers. As a rule, the coloured labourers employed in the cotton-growing districts of the world, whence the European supply of cotton has hitherto been obtained, have been in a state of slavery, and are so still.

The account I have given of the sources of the British supply at the time when the manufacture of cotton was beginning to assume dimensions of national importance, shows that three-fourths of that supply was then obtained from the British, French, Spanish, Dutch, and Portuguese colonies; in all of which agricultural labour was performed by slaves exclusively. The very small quantity then obtained from the East Indies, through Ostend, may be altogether disregarded. And the remainder—less than one-fourth of the whole—obtained from Smyrna or Turkey, can scarcely be set down as the fruit of free labour.

In 1824-5-6 the sources of supply were materially changed. But

of the entire quantity then imported into Britain, the United States of America, Brazil, and the West Indies, all using only slave-labour in the culture of cotton, supplied seventy-nine per cent. Six and a-half per cent. came from Turkey and Egypt. Nine per cent. from the East Indies. And the remainder, from "all other countries," is about five per cent. of the whole.

In 1853-4-5 eighty per cent. of our supply came from the United States and Brazil alone, and was clearly the produce of slave-labour. Very little of the three per cent. obtained from "the Mediterranean" can be set down as probably raised by free labour. And nearly the whole of the remaining seventeen per cent. came from the East Indies.

In short, there is not, and never has been, any considerable source of supply for cotton, excepting the East Indies, which is not obviously and exclusively maintained by slave-labour.

The value of the exception, as indicating a probability of our ultimately obtaining even the greater part of our cotton without the use of slave-labour, remains to be determined. Judging by what I have been able to learn of the facts, I deem its value but small. The condition of the Ryot does not appear to be such as to impart to his operations, either as a labourer for hire, or as an independent cotton-grower, the productive advantages we are accustomed to associate with our idea of free-labour. He seems to be, in point of fact, little better than a slave. The cotton of India does not hold a high rank in the European market, in point of quality. And the price at which it can be imported does not admit of its being brought into active competition in Europe with cotton of similar quality from the slave-holding countries of the west.

The personal inquiries of the late Mr. Mackay, who was, a few years ago, deputed by the Chambers of Commerce of Liverpool, Manchester, Blackburn, and Glasgow, to ascertain, in the cotton-growing districts of the United States, and of India, whether the supply from India admitted of being increased in quantity, or reduced in price, led, obviously, to a negative conclusion. He found that cotton from India entered the European markets only as supplementary to the American supply; for that, taking quality and price into consideration, it could not be imported so cheaply,—and was received, in any considerable quantity, only (1) when the American supply failed, or (2) when the demand for consumption increased, and, from one or both of these causes, the price rose materially above the average. These facts are quite as easily ascertained in the European market as in America or in India; and they have not been altered since Mr. Mackay made his report.

But that gentleman deemed it probable that the state of things which had already obtained for India cotton an occasional and temporary command of the European market would, at no distant date, become more permanent, and transfer, in great part, to the cotton-growers of India the lucrative office of sustaining the future growth of the British cotton manufacture. He maintained that the American planters could not go on increasing their supply, year by year, in proportion to a demand of so rapid growth as ours; and that, as soon as this became apparent, a permanent rise of price must take place,



sufficient to bring new and regular supplies into the market; and that, as India had long supplied the occasional deficiencies of the American crop, she would then be enabled to compete, on at least equal terms, with America.

But this conclusion avowedly rested on two assumptions:—1st, that the American supply had been increased mainly by continual resort to more fertile land; and 2nd, that this process was about to be put an end to by the gradual exhaustion of the more fertile land.

Now, neither of these assumptions has yet been sustained by adequate proof. All analogy suggests that capital and skill in cultivation have, in cotton-growing as in all else, during the last fifty years, had a large share in increasing the production of American cotton. That skill in the selection of new soils has had a share in the same result is equally probable. Of capital, and of skill in cultivation, there will probably be as much in the time to come as in the time past. Whether the requisite soil will fall short is another question; and one not so easily answered. We have abundant evidence that the relative productiveness of cotton plantations is dependent, in a great measure, upon various local circumstances: as elevation, temperature, moisture, nature of soil, and proximity to the sea; but we have no evidence whatever that the soil possessing the requisite qualifications, within the present *or probable* limits of the American union, is all, or nearly all, exhausted or occupied.

Nor does the relation between the American cotton crop and the British consumption of cotton, during the last twenty years, warrant the apprehension that the former cannot be increased as fast as the latter. The following is the British statement of the quantity of cotton imported into the United Kingdom during this period:—

	lbs.		lbs.
1836.....	406,959,000	1846.....	467,856,000
1837.....	407,286,000	1847.....	474,707,000
1838.....	507,850,000	1848.....	713,020,000
1839.....	389,396,000	1849.....	755,469,000
1840.....	592,481,000	1850.....	663,576,000
1841.....	487,992,000	1851.....	757,379,000
1842.....	531,750,000	1852.....	929,782,000
1843.....	673,193,000	1853.....	895,278,000
1844.....	646,111,000	1854.....	887,333,000
1845.....	721,979,000	1855.....	891,752,000

And the American statements of the amount of the crop raised in the United States, in the corresponding twenty years, each year ending 31st August, is as follows:—

	Bales.		Bales.
1836-37 .....	1,422,000	1846-47 .....	1,778,000
1837-38 .....	1,801,000	1847-48 .....	2,347,000
1838-39 .....	1,360,000	1848-49 .....	2,728,000
1839-40 .....	2,177,000	1849-50 .....	2,096,000
1840-41 .....	1,634,000	1850-51 .....	2,355,000
1841-42 .....	1,683,000	1851-52 .....	3,015,000
1842-43 .....	2,378,000	1852-53 .....	3,262,000
1843-44 .....	3,030,000	1853-54 .....	2,930,000
1844-45 .....	2,394,000	1854-55 .....	2,147,000
1845-46 .....	2,100,000	1855-56* .....	3,527,000

\* New York Shipping and Commercial List, 17th September, 1856.

In the first of these tables the average of the first three years is to that of the last three years as 1,507 to 3,101; and in the second table the relation is as 440 to 891:—each is a little more than doubled. The American supply forms so large a proportion of all we import, that fluctuations in one must be accompanied by something like corresponding changes in the other. But, though we have other sources of supply, we find that for twenty years the crop raised in the United States has grown steadily with our demand. The price also is lower and steadier now than it was twenty years ago: an indication of something more than a continual resort to virgin soil. In October of each of the years referred to, Bowed Georgia Cotton was thus quoted in England:—

1835.....	9d. to 11½d. per lb.	1854.....	5¼d. to 6¼d. per lb.
1836.....	7¾d. „ 11½d. „	1855.....	5d. „ 6½d. „
1837.....	5½d. „ 7¾d. „	1856.....	5d. „ 7½d. „

It appears, then, that cotton has hitherto been grown, and, as far as yet appears, must continue to be grown, chiefly by slave-labour. More particular evidence of this will be found in the proofs afforded of the two next propositions.

#### THE THIRD PROPOSITION.

*That, for the last fifty years, Great Britain, seeking her supply of cotton all over the earth, with a preference, during the greater part of that period, for the produce of free-labour, has yet received, during the whole of that period, and continues to receive, all the cotton she imports, of the better qualities, and by far the greater part of all she imports, in bulk, as well as in value, from countries in which it is grown by slave-labour.*

In the ten years, 1801-10, the whole quantity of cotton wool imported into the United Kingdom was 592,000,000 lbs.\* In the same ten years we imported from the United States 263,000,000 lbs., or *forty per cent. of the whole.*

In the next ten years, 1811-20, our commerce with the United States was, for two years, stopped by war. We imported 1,004 millions of pounds; and obtained 449 millions, or nearly half of it, from the United States.†

In 1821-30 the total importation was 2,008 millions; and the United States' share of it was *seventy-one per cent.*‡

In 1831-40 we imported, in all, 3,873 millions of pounds, and took *seventy-nine per cent.* of it from the United States.§

In 1840-50 the whole quantity imported was 6,335 millions of pounds; and from the United States 4,985 millions, or *seventy-eight per cent.*§

And in the five years 1851-55, when we imported 4,361 millions of pounds, we obtained 3,424 millions, or *seventy-eight per cent.* of it from the United States.§

During a great part of this period we gave a decided preference to the produce of free-labour.

\* Marshall's Digest, 1833.

† Pitkin's Statistical View of the Commerce of the United States, 1817; and Marshall.

‡ Pitkin, Marshall, and the Revenue Tables, 1820-33.

§ Revenue Tables for the years in question.

Until 1798 we levied no import duty on cotton. The duties then imposed were 12*s.* 6*d.* per 100 lbs. on Brazilian, 8*s.* 9*d.* on West Indian, 6*s.* 6*d.* on American, and 4 per cent. *ad valorem* on East Indian. At this time, then, as well as afterwards, the cotton of the East Indies was decidedly favoured; and the cotton from that quarter has, during the whole period in view, formed by far the largest part of all that has been asserted to be raised by free-labour.

In 1803 an uniform duty of 16*s.* 8*d.* per 100 lbs. was imposed on West Indian, American, and East Indian cotton; and 25*s.* on Brazilian.

These duties were but slightly altered down to 1815, when an uniform duty of 8*s.* 7*d.* per 100 lbs. was imposed on all these descriptions.

Some further changes, favourable to East Indian cotton, took place between 1815 and 1833, and the duties were, in 1833, settled at 4*d.* per cwt. on cotton from British possessions, and 2*s.* 11*d.* per cwt. on foreign. Excepting the general increase of 5 per cent. on nearly all customs duties made in May, 1840, these duties remained unchanged till they were all repealed in March, 1845.

From 1828 to 1845 the differential duty in favour of the cotton of East Indian growth was considerable. And though circumstances did not favour the maintenance of a heavy duty as a means of discouraging slave-labour, there can be no reasonable doubt that the legislature, during that period, gave, and meant to give, some degree of encouragement to the growth of cotton in our own tropical possessions, and, therefore, by labour either then free or intended shortly to become so.

That such encouragement did not prevent the planters of the United States and Brazil from gradually increasing the proportion of our total supply from them, till it amounted to more than four-fifths, in quantity alone, the facts already stated amply prove. And that the descriptions of cotton which bear the highest price in the market—which possess the greatest value in a given weight—are also supplied, almost exclusively, by the United States, is a fact apparent on the face of every price current in which cotton has a place.

#### THE FOURTH PROPOSITION.

*That cotton is grown in the United States exclusively by slave-labour.*

The chief cotton-growing states are South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Florida. These are all slave-holding states, and in 1850 contained 1,942,966 of the entire number of 3,204,313 slaves then within the Union.

There are three other states which grow cotton, but in less quantities. These are Virginia, North Carolina, and Arkansas. These contained, in 1850, 806,176 slaves.

Of the twenty-one other states, sixteen may be said to have been, in 1850, non-slaveholding; no slaves being returned in fifteen of them, and in the remaining one (New Jersey) only 236. And the remaining five—Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, Texas, and Missouri, together with the district of Columbia and the territory of Utah, contained the rest of the slave population—about 453,000 in number.

The chief cotton-growing states are also the chief slave-holding states. All the states in which cotton is grown as an article of commerce have a slave population so large in proportion to the whole as, practically, to exclude the white population from such labour in the field as is required in the culture of cotton. And though no evidence more direct, and of a strictly statistical character, can be offered of the fact, it hardly admits of a reasonable doubt that this proposition is true; and that cotton is grown in the United States exclusively by slave-labour.

#### THE FIFTH PROPOSITION.

*That two-thirds, at least, of the slave population of the United States are employed in raising cotton for exportation.*

Of the proportion of the slave population employed in raising cotton, or maintained, directly or indirectly, for the supply of the cotton demand for slave-labour in the United States, we have no direct evidence. The circumstantial evidence which seems to me to support this proposition may be arranged under four heads:—

1. The pre-eminence of the cotton-culture among the industrial occupations of the slave states.

2. The increase of the slave population in relation to the increased production of cotton.

3. The distribution of the increase of the slave population, with reference to the localities in which the cotton is grown.

4. The relation between the quantity of cotton produced for exportation, and the number of slave-labourers required.

Each of these heads I will deal with separately.

I. With exceptions not worthy of notice, the entire slave population is found in the southern states; and cotton is grown only in these states. The industry of these states is almost wholly agricultural; and their exportable produce is all agricultural. Its three principal items are cotton, tobacco, and rice; and these include so large a share of the whole of the exportable produce of the southern states that the remainder may, for the present purpose, be disregarded.

We have no means of distinguishing, very precisely, the value of the exports from the southern states in the general account of the exports of the country, as published by the United States' Government. But the three articles, cotton, tobacco, and rice, are raised only in the southern states, so are properly referred exclusively to them.

The rice exported from the Union in 1803, which was what might be termed an average year, was valued at 2,445,000 dollars.\* In the year ending 30th June, 1851, the corresponding value was 2,171,000 dollars. Here there was no increase of value.

Tobacco was, in the earlier years of the century, grown chiefly in two of the southern states: Virginia and Maryland; and it is still grown almost wholly in that district of the Union.† And that the

\* Pitkin, 129.

† Kentucky and Tennessee, together, have, of late years, produced about as much tobacco as Maryland and Virginia; and adjacent parts of North Carolina and Ohio also produce considerable quantities.

value of the exports has not increased greatly during the last half-century is apparent in a comparison of the value of those of 1803 with those of 1851: at the first period 6,209,000 dollars,\* and at the second 9,219,000 dollars.†

It is obvious, then, that the enormous additional supply of slave-labour raised within the southern states during the last fifty years has not found profitable employment in the production of either rice or tobacco.

The cotton exported from the United States in 1803, in which year the quantity was above an average of the years preceding and following, was 41 millions of pounds. In 1851 the corresponding quantity was 927 millions of pounds, or considerably more than twenty-fold. Finally, the cotton exported now forms, regularly, more than half in value of the entire exports of the United States.

II. The increase of the slave population, in the whole Union, is shown in the following figures:—

	Number of Slaves.	
In 1800.....	893,041	
1810.....	1,191,364	Increase in 10 years 34 per cent,
1820.....	1,531,064	“    “    29    “
1830.....	2,009,031	“    “    31    “
1840.....	2,487,355	“    “    24    “
1851.....	3,204,313	“    “    28    “

The increase in the seven states (South Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, and Florida), which grow the most cotton, has been much more rapid:—

	Number of Slaves.	
In 1800.....	222,628	
1810.....	397,866	Increase in 10 years 78 per cent.
1820.....	631,995	“    “    58    “
1830.....	982,832	“    “    55    “
1840.....	1,433,953	“    “    46    “
1850.....	1,942,966	“    “    35    “

The United States abolished the slave trade simultaneously with ourselves, in 1807. But it is not improbable that for the first ten years (1800–1810) some considerable addition was made to the slave population from this source.

The increase during the same period, of the quantity of cotton grown in the United States may be inferred from the following data:— On the 29th February, 1836, the Hon. Levi Woodbury, Secretary of the Treasury, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives a communication containing some elaborate “Tables and notes on the cultivation, manufacture, and foreign trade of cotton;” and from these it appears that the quantity of cotton grown in the United States, according to the best available estimate, was

In 1800 .....	35 millions of pounds.
In 1810 .....	85    “    “
In 1820 .....	160    “    “
And in 1830 .....	350    “    “

\* Pitkin.

† Revenue Tables, 1851.

For the subsequent decennial periods we have the current statements of the crop published in the United States annually. According to these, the average of the crops of the three years, 1838-39, (ending 31st August, 1839,) 1839-40 and 1840-41, was 1,724,000 bales; and the corresponding average for the three years 1848-49, 1849-50, and 1850-51, was 2,393,000 bales.

The weight of the bale of cotton, as made up in the United States, has been gradually increasing during the greater part of the fifty years in view, with the increasing facilities for close packing, and the inducement to economise freight, by reducing a given weight to the smallest bulk. Assuming that the average weight of the bale, in the United States was, in 1840, about 380 lbs., and in 1850 about 450 lbs., the average crop may be taken—

In 1840 at	655 millions of pounds, and
In 1850 at	1,077       ,,       ,,

I will say a few words, before closing this statement, on the weight of the bale of cotton at various periods.

III. As has been stated, the principal cotton-growing states are seven in number. Five only of these states (South Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi,\* were included in the Union in 1800, or therefore appeared in the census of that year. These, then, contained a total of 222,628 slaves. In 1850 there were in these five states 1,658,847 slaves. Adjoining these there were also, in 1850, the two other chief cotton-growing states (Louisiana and Florida,) containing 284,119 slaves. Two other states growing cotton, but less exclusively so (Virginia and South Carolina,) included in the Union in 1800, and containing at that date a slave population of 479,092, had, in 1850, one of 761,076. And Arkansas, a new state, falling into the same category, had, in 1850, a slave population of 47,100.

There were, in 1850, twenty-one other states in the Union. From the list of these, for a reason shortly to be stated, I exclude Kentucky. The remaining twenty had, in 1800, a slave population of 145,023; and, in 1850, one of 238,477.

More clearly the results may be stated thus:—

The seven states in which the growth of cotton is, beyond all comparison, the principal occupation of the inhabitants, had, in 1800, only 222,628 slaves, and in 1850 they had 1,942,966: showing an addition of 1,720 338, or *seven hundred and seventy-three per cent.*

In three other states also growing cotton largely, but less exclusively, there was an increase of 329,084, or *sixty-eight per cent.* in fifty years.

In the rest of the Union, excluding Kentucky, the number added was 93,454, or *sixty-four per cent.* in fifty years.

The whole increase of the slave population, in the fifty years, was from 893,041 to 3,204,313, an addition of 2,311,272, or 259 per cent.; and as the United States abolished the slave trade, simultaneously with ourselves, in 1807, and the census of 1810 shows an increase of 34 per cent. in the preceding ten years, it is obvious that this large increase must have been derived, during the fifty years, almost entirely from an excess of births over deaths within the Union.

\* In the census of 1800 Alabama and Mississippi were returned together.

The amount of this excess may afford ground for suspecting that the physical condition of the slave population has not been, on the whole, so unhappy as it has sometimes been stated to be. This, however, forms no part of the present question.

It is apparent that the slave population, while increasing thus rapidly, has had its increase distributed mainly with reference to the production of cotton.

A similar process has been going on, during the same period, in Great Britain, with reference mainly to the *manufacture* of the same article. The general increase of the population of the island, during the fifty years, has been about 100 per cent.; but upon an area of about 220,000 acres surrounding Manchester, the increase during the same period has been 235 per cent.; and in Manchester, and in fifteen other towns included in this area, the increase (of town population alone) has been 320 per cent.\*

Here we have brought to view, as sustaining, indirectly, both now and all through the fifty years in view, the rapid extension of the cotton culture, the slave population of some of the states in which cotton is grown but little, or not at all. During the whole of this period the slave population of the more northern slave-holding districts has been gradually diminishing. Manumission has done something, and migration southward has done more, to effect this. Also, during the last twenty years, slaves have been systematically reared in several of these states for transmission to those further south.

Kentucky appears to be the chief slave-breeding state of the Union; and hence I have excluded it, in particular, from the list of those not taking a prominent part in the growth of cotton. Virginia, and all the more northern of the slave states, undoubtedly partake in this traffic. Of the slave population of Kentucky, which, in 1800, was 40,343, and in 1850 was 210,981, a large proportion may, therefore, be justly held to have been brought into existence, and to be maintained, with a view to the production of cotton. And some portion of the slave population of several of the adjoining states might, no doubt, with propriety, be added on the same score.

The precise extent of the internal migration thus indicated cannot be ascertained. We see, in gross, that of the entire addition made to the slave population in fifty years (2,311,000) 1,720,000, or more than three-fourths is, at the end of the period, found in the seven states distinguished for their production of cotton. And if we take the returns for each state containing slaves in 1840, and compare them with the returns of 1850, we may infer, very nearly, the general direction, and nearly the amount, of the recent migration into these cotton-growing states.

In 1840 the Union contained 2,487,345 slaves, and in 1850, 3,204,313. The increase, in ten years, was nearly 29 per cent. This, therefore, may be taken to be the average excess of births over deaths throughout the slave population, for that period. It would be higher in the more northern and breeding states; and lower in those,

\* "On the Area and Population of the Manchester District."—A paper in the 8th volume of the Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, by the Author of this statement.

especially the recently settled districts, in which the labour was most severe and continuous.

Had the seven chief cotton-growing states increased only at this rate, the addition to their population, during the ten years, would have been about 415,847. The addition was, in fact, 509,019, and the excess, 93,166, is the lowest number that can be set down as that of the slaves transferred to these from other states, in that interval. In fact, it is too low to accord with the most obvious inferences from the rate of mortality, and the condition of the slave population, at the reproductive period of life, in the seven cotton-growing states, as compared with the rate of mortality, and the like condition, in the rest of the Union, and more particularly in the districts whence this migration chiefly took place. As the natural increase arises entirely from excess of births over deaths, circumstances such as those known to prevail in the cotton-growing states importing slaves, and tending powerfully to check the rearing of children, and to cut off the adult population at an early age, must be presumed, in the absence of direct evidence to the contrary, to reduce the rate of this increase, in those states, considerably below the average deduced from the increase of the whole slave population. On the other hand, it is well known that, in what are termed the "breeding" states, peculiar efforts are made to promote the production and rearing of children of the slave population. Now, the increase of the population of England and Wales, by excess of births over deaths, between 1841 and 1851, allowing for emigration, cannot be taken at more than 15 per cent. We have seen that the average increase of the slave population of the United States, in the same interval, was 29 per cent. Assuming that the increase by excess of births over deaths, in the seven chief cotton-growing states, was so much as 25 per cent., it would amount only to 358,488, leaving an excess of 150,525 to be accounted for by immigration.

The states supplying this migratory body—that is to say, all the other states of the Union—had, in 1840, a slave population of 1,053,000; and, in 1850, one of 1,261,000. According to the census of 1840, about 15 per cent. of the slave population consisted of males between 10 and 24 years of age—the age at which the emigration would be most likely to take place. Taking a mean between the numbers of 1840 and 1850, the class of the population thus supplying the emigrants would number about 162,500. If the females of the same age be added, the number would be nearly doubled; and it might be increased by allowing for the removal of some slaves southward at other ages. It is, however, obvious that a draft of 150,000 persons, in ten years, taken from the able-bodied section of a total population of 1,100,000 or 1,200,000 persons would be almost as much as such a population, even when endowed with the peculiar fecundity of the slave population of the United States, could sustain, without impairing its reproductive power; and, accordingly, while the seven principal cotton states show an increase of their slave population, between 1840 and 1850, of 35 per cent., the other slaves states, taken together, exhibit an increase of less than 20 per cent.

IV. In the tables and notes of Mr Woodbury, already referred to, it is estimated that the culture of the cotton crop of the United



States, in 1835, gave employment to 340,000 field hands, worth, on an average, 800 dollars each, and to as many assistants, worth, on an average, 400 dollars each.

The crop of the year ending 31st August, 1835, was estimated at 1,250,000 bales, or, allowing 340 pounds to the bale, about 439 millions of pounds. As has been stated, the crop in 1850 was, apparently, about 1,077 millions of pounds.

Adopting the proportion suggested by Mr. Woodbury's estimate for 1835, the number of field hands required in 1850 would be 834,000; and the number of assistants the same; making a total of 1,668,000 labourers.

It appears from the censuses of 1840 and 1850, that rather more than one-third of the slave population is under 10 years of age; and that about 4 in 100 are over 55 years of age. Excluding only 6 per cent. more for sickness and other causes, we have the following account, as that of the slave population actually engaged in raising cotton in 1850:—

Labourers.....	1,668,000
Infants (say) .....	850,000
Aged.....	100,000
Sick, &c. ....	150,000
	<hr/>
	2,768,000

Possibly, Mr. Woodbury's estimate may have been excessive; or its application to the circumstances of 1850 may be, in some respects, improper. Hence the number above stated may be in excess of the truth. On the other hand, however, it will be observed that no allowance is made for such portion of the slave population of the states as, though not engaged in, or even resident near the localities of, the cotton culture, are, for the purpose of keeping up, by migration, the required supply of labour, maintained expressly for the support of that branch of the national industry.

We have now to ascertain how much of the whole crop thus raised is so raised for exportation. This may be deduced from the following figures, extracted from the *New York Shipping and Commercial List* of 17th September, 1856:—

*Year ending 31st August.*

	Annual Crop.	Retained for Home Consumption.
	<hr/> Bales. <hr/>	<hr/> Bales. <hr/>
1851-52 .....	3,015,029	603,029
1852-53 .....	3,262,882	671,009
1853-54 .....	2,930,027	610,571
1854-55 .....	2,847,339	593,584
1855-56 .....	3,527,845	652,739

It is to be observed that the portion of the crop retained for home use includes a very small proportion of the finer and more valuable qualities of cotton; and hence that the four-fifths of the crop here shewn to have been left for exportation would probably include more than four-fifths in value.

And if, following this proportion, only 2,000,000 of the slave population be assigned to the culture for export, this will be equal to about two-thirds of the entire number.

The number thus set apart is a large one; but it will be remembered, apart from the direct estimate of numbers, that all that portion of the slave population which is maintained with a view to the cotton culture, whether actually engaged in it or not, must be deemed to fall into the category referred to in this fifth proposition,—That of the entire produce of the United States, raised for exportation, cotton forms more than half in value;\* That it is all planted, cultivated, picked, dressed, and packed for exportation by slave labour; That the natural increase of the slave population is obviously distributed with reference, almost exclusively, to the demand for labour in the cotton-growing districts; That of the entire slave population of the Union, at the last census, twenty-seven parts out of thirty-two, or nearly nine-tenths, were found in the ten states growing cotton largely, and That nineteen parts out of thirty-two were found in the seven states, the capital and labour of which are peculiarly devoted to that branch of industry.

#### THE SIXTH PROPOSITION.

*That, of the cotton thus raised for exportation, about two-thirds in quantity, and more than two-thirds in value, is raised expressly for the British market; and is regularly imported into, and manufactured in, the United Kingdom.*

According to Pitkin's Analysis, before referred to,† it appears that the whole quantity of cotton exported from the United States, in the three years, 1801–2–3, was  $89\frac{1}{2}$  millions of pounds; and that the quantity sent to Great Britain, in the same period, was 70 millions of pounds. The "Tables and Notes" of Mr. Woodbury furnish very nearly the same figures. At this time, then, Great Britain took about two-thirds of the American exports.

For the years, 1821–22–23, Mr. Woodbury states that the total exports amounted to 443 millions of pounds; and that the quantity sent direct to Great Britain was 337 millions; shewing nearly the same proportion.

Accounts published by the Board of Trade shew that, in the two years (ending 30th June) 1841–42 and 1842–43, the exports amounted to a total of 3,453,999 bales; and the quantity sent to the United Kingdom to 2,398,399 bales.‡

For recent years the proportion can be ascertained only by calculation. The quantity exported from the United States may be

\* In the year ending 30th June, 1851, the whole exports were valued at 196,000,000 dollars—the cotton exported at 112,000,000.

† Pitkin, pp. 132–137.

‡ Revenue Tables, Foreign, 1844, p. 274.

obtained with sufficient accuracy by deducting from the whole crop of each year the quantity retained for home consumption; and the quantity sent to this country may be inferred, with a similar approximation to accuracy, from the quantity imported into this country. It is, however, to be remembered that the American statements\* of the annual crop have reference to a year ending on the 31st of August, before which time very little of the crop of the year referred to can have appeared at market, or, consequently, have been shipped to this country. Hence, the American statement, for any given year, has reference almost entirely to the cotton received in our ports in the year next following, and ending on 31st December.

The American estimates of the annual crop, for the five years, beginning with 1849-50, and ending with 1853-54, give a total of 13,659,901 bales.† On the same authority, the quantity retained for home consumption, in the same period, was 2,776,486 bales. The remainder (10,883,415 bales) would, doubtless, be somewhat in excess of the quantity actually exported. But allowing 5 per cent. for what may be used in the states otherwise than for manufacture, for waste, and for loss; and allowing an average weight of 450lbs to the bale, the whole quantity exported from the crops of the five years referred to would be about 4,652 millions of pounds.

The five years in which our share of this quantity must have entered the ports of the United Kingdom were those beginning with 1851 and ending with 1855. In these years we received from the United States a total of 3,424 millions of pounds.‡

So that the share we have taken of the cotton exported from the United States would appear to have varied but little throughout the whole period of fifty-five years; and to have been, all through, about *two-thirds*, as stated in the proposition.

#### THE SEVENTH PROPOSITION.

*That, of the entire quantity of cotton imported into, and manufactured in the United Kingdom, nearly four-fifths in quantity, and more than four-fifths in value, is, on an average of years, obtained from the United States.*

Annexed will be found a table exhibiting the quantity of cotton imported into the United Kingdom, in each year, from 1801 to 1855 inclusive; and the proportion of each year's importation received from the United States, whence it appears that:—

In the first ten years of the present century (1801-10), the supply from the United States amounted to *forty-four* parts in a hundred of all we imported.

In the second ten years (1811-20) it was nearly *fifty* parts in a hundred.

In the third ten years (1821-30) it was *seventy-one* parts.

In the fourth ten years (1831-40) it was *seventy-nine* parts.

\* I use the word "statement" here in deference to custom. "Estimate" would be a more correct term; but that being commonly applied to the conjectures made of the amount of the coming crop, would be objected to in Liverpool, and in America.

† New York List, 17th September, 1856.

‡ Statistical Abstract, 1841 to 1851, p. 17.

In the fifth ten years (1841-50) it was *eighty-one* parts. And in the five years which have elapsed since the close of the last period (1851-55), it was *seventy-eight* parts.

Again, if we limit our view to the last twenty years (1836-55), and divide these into four periods of five years each, we find that we obtained from the United States, of the total quantity we imported:—

In 1836-40.....	Eighty	per cent.		In 1846-50.....	Eighty-one	per cent.
1841-45.....	Eighty-one	„		1851-55.....	Seventy-eight	„

And, again, if we take the proportion year by year, for the last ten years, it stands thus:—

1846 .....	88	per cent.		1851 .....	78	per cent.
1847 .....	76	„		1852 .....	82	„
1848 .....	84	„		1853 .....	73	„
1849 .....	83	„		1854 .....	81	„
1850 .....	74	„		1855 .....	76	„

Whence, and bearing in mind that the supply from the United States includes all the more valuable descriptions of cotton, I venture to affirm that we cannot safely estimate the average extent of our reliance upon the United States, for a supply of cotton, at less than about 80 per cent., or four-fifths of the entire quantity we import.

And now it may not be out of place to repeat the conclusions to which this series of propositions have conducted me. They are—

*I. That, in the present state of the commercial relations of the two countries, the cotton-planters of the United States are interested to the extent of about two-thirds of their exportable produce, in the maintenance of the cotton-manufacture of the United Kingdom;—and*

*II. That, reciprocally, the cotton-manufacturers of the United Kingdom, and, through them, the entire population of the kingdom, are interested, to the extent of four-fifths of the raw material of that manufacture, in the existing arrangements for maintaining the cotton-culture of the United States.*

On the important bearing of these conclusions, assuming them to be sound, upon any proceedings for modifying the existing system of slave-labour in the United States, I cannot but deem it superfluous to say one word.

#### NOTE ON THE WEIGHT OF THE BALE OF COTTON, AT VARIOUS PERIODS.

In 1810 the average weight of the bales of cotton, exported from the United States, was about 300 lbs., and those imported into England from Portugal and the Portuguese colonies, our next largest source of supply at the same time, were said not to exceed an average of 110lbs.\*

\* Pitkin's Statistical View of the Commerce of the United States. 2nd Edition, 1817, p. 136.

In 1833, Mr. Joshua Bates (of the firm of Baring Brothers and Co.), being examined before a Committee of the House of Commons, handed in some tabular statements, whence it might be inferred that the average weight of the American bale of cotton remained, from 1794 to 1832, nearly the same, or about 300 lbs.\* From a comparison of various other accounts, and particularly from the data supplied by the letter of the 29th February, 1836, from the American Secretary to the Treasury to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, previously referred to, it may, however, reasonably be inferred that the average weight, in the latter years of this period, was nearer 350 lbs.

In December, 1843, Messrs. George Holt and Co., eminent cotton brokers, of Liverpool, estimated the average weight of the bales imported from different countries into Liverpool in that year as follows:—†

United States—Upland and Sea Island.....	350 lbs.
"          Orleans and Alabama .....	430   "
Brazil .....	182   "
Egyptian .....	207   "
East Indian.....	378   "
West Indian .....	165   "

Allowing for the large proportion of the whole quantity imported from the United States, it is probable that the general average was then not less than 400 lbs., and that the average weight of the bale from the United States a little exceeded that limit.

An estimate made in Liverpool, at my own instance, upon the experience of 1855, gave the following results:—

Average weight per bale from the United States ....	450 lbs.
From Brazil .....	200   "
From Madras and Bombay .....	420   "
From Calcutta .....	300   "
From Egypt .....	280   "

The increased weight appears to have been due to increased pressure in packing, to save freight—that element of cost being much dependent on the space occupied by a given weight.

So much for the weight of the bale of cotton, as seen in Great Britain. As seen in the cotton manufacturing districts of America, the modes of conveyance from the cotton-growing districts not being precisely the same, the bales may possibly have a different weight. But in the absence of evidence on this point it may be assumed that the bale alluded to in the American account of the quantity retained for home consumption has an average weight of 450 lbs.

\* Report from Committee on Manufactures, Commerce, and Shipping. No. 690 of 1833.

† M'Culloch's Dictionary of Commerce,—art. Cotton.

*British Imports of Cotton Wool, 1800 to 1855.*

[N.B.—The figures in the first column of this table are obtained, for the years 1801 to 1819 inclusive, from “Marshall’s Digest,” printed at the recommendation of the House of Commons in 1833,—for the years 1820-33 from the “Revenue Tables,” 1820-33, p. 125,—for 1831-40 from the “Revenue Tables,” 1831-40, p. 115,—and for the years 1841-55 from the “Statistical Abstract,” 1841-55, printed in 1856. The figures in the second column are obtained from “Pitkin’s Statistical View of the Commerce of the United States,” second edition, 1817, down to 1816,—for the years 1817-18-19 they are deduced from an account in “Marshall’s Digest,” p. 113, allowing 300 lbs. to the bale; and thereafter from the “Revenue Tables.”]

(In the second and third columns of this table three figures are omitted on the right hand, so that millions read as thousands.)

YEARS.	Col. 2. Imported into the United Kingdom.	Col. 3. Imported from the United States.	YEARS.	Col. 2. Imported into the United Kingdom.	Col. 3. Imported from the United States.
1801....	55,675*	18,953	1828...	227,760	151,752
1802....	60,239	23,473	1829...	222,767	157,187
1803....	53,427	27,757	1830....	263,961	210,885
1804....	61,316	25,770			
1805....	59,649	32,661	1831...	288,674	219,333
1806...	57,982	24,255	1832...	286,832	219,756
1807....	74,786	53,180	1833...	303,656	237,506
1808....	43,263	7,992	1834...	326,875	269,203
1809....	91,701	13,365	1835...	363,702	284,455
1810....	134,805	36,171	1836...	406,959	289,615
			1837...	407,286	320,651
1811...	91,008	46,772	1838...	507,850	431,437
1812....	61,563	26,086	1839...	389,396	311,597
1813....	....	....	1840....	592,488	487,856
1814....	58,887	....			
1815....	98,790	45,669	1841 ..	487,992	358,240
1816....	93,685	57,793	1842....	531,750	414,030
1817...	124,303	52,668	1843...	673,193	574,738
1818....	177,178	65,985	1844...	646,111	517,218
1819....	149,467	63,675	1845...	721,979	626,650
1820....	149,322	89,999	1846 ..	467,856	401,949
			1847...	474,707	364,599
1821....	132,536	93,470	1848...	713,020	600,247
1822....	142,837	101,131	1849....	755,469	634,504
1823....	191,402	142,532	1850 ..	663,576	493,153
1824....	149,380	92,187	1851...	757,379	596,638
1825....	228,005	139,908	1852...	929,782	765,630
1826....	177,607	130,858	1853...	895,278	658,451
1827....	272,448	216,924	1854...	887,333	722,151
			1855...	891,752	681,629